

# **Maine Learning Results Review Advisory Committee Minutes February 8, 2005**

## **In attendance:**

Karoldene Barnes, Anita Bernhardt, Don Cannan, John Dorrer, Francis Eberle, Bonnie Fortini, Deborah Howard, Janice LaChance, Tom Major, Bette Manchester, Ellie Multer, Josh Nadel, MaryJo O'Connor, Patrick Phillips, Dan Hupp. Valerie Seaberg, Harriet Trafford, Jon Geiger.

## **Welcome and Introductions:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair, MaryJo O'Connor. MaryJo reviewed the group norms. Introductions were made.

## **A frame for our work:**

Patrick Phillips stated that our recommendations will assure that there are innovative programs providing opportunities for ALL students to learn.

Our charge is to determine factors in the schools which are not meeting the learning needs of students. We need to consider which things are not present in our standards and which things are present which shouldn't be present.

## **Review of last meeting:**

Time was spent at our first meeting reviewing the work to be done. 3 major themes came out of our meeting:

1. We need to make sure there is time for stakeholder input.
2. The results must reflect the radically changing world.
3. We need to ensure that we tap the knowledge within the business community.

Others provided input which was not discussed at the last meeting.

1. There does not appear to be enough connection between DOE and the University systems who are preparing student for teaching in our schools.
2. Jim Carignan, Chair of the State Board of Education, will be heading up a panel of people whose purpose is to determine what's future education should look like and what factors are out there which will influence education. The group is looking at what skills and supports our students will need to be successful in the world of work and play 10 – 20 years in the future.

A report should be available this summer.

## **Review of the three groups:**

Anita provided a brief overview of the focus of each of the following three groups who are associated with the *Learning Results*. She wanted to make sure that everyone understood the roles and responsibilities of each group

1. *Learning Results* Steering Committee: This group has oversight and policy making authority.
2. Review Advisory Committee: This group is charged with developing a process and providing implementation oversight for the *Learning Results* review. They are also responsible for recommending any revisions to the MLR to the *Learning Results* Steering Committee.

3. Standards, Assessment and Regional Services Team: This group will be advisory to the Maine Learning Results Review Advisory Committee.

### **Learn Together Activity:**

Anita reviewed the process for our small group discussions concerning “Reading Proficiency for All”, a White Paper by Dr. Willard Daggett.

The following four goals were established:

1. The end product must have integrity.
2. Develop a process which brings all voices to the table.
3. Keep the conversation open Pre-K through grade 16.
4. Establish a system which promotes increased learning for all kids and is sensible for students and teachers.

The following ideas were generated during a discussion:

(II= Implementation Issues)

1. Literacy is essential to the Review.
  2. What does literacy mean?
  3. Schools are should be changing with society.
  4. Staff development is key. (II)
  5. All parts of the system must take responsibility for literacy. (II)
  6. Every discipline has its own literacy.
  7. Thinking skills/strategies must be addressed along with text integration.
  8. Measurement of student achievement must be addressed systematically.
  9. What are we will to reposition (give up, re-think, structurally change)?
  10. More effective literacy will allow us to do more/work successfully.
  11. There must be a rigorous, rich 12th grade experience. (II)
  12. Focus- Do students know how to “read to learn”?
  13. There must have literacy about something.
  14. Teachers will need professional support to understand what it means to teach literacy K-12. (II)
  15. Where will this fit with the Guiding Principles?
  16. There must be alignment with colleges of education. (II)
  17. Literacy in part is intended to ensure democracy participation (life, work, citizenship)
  18. Are reading expectations clear in each content area? (Reading Recovery Model)
  19. Reading is fundamental to work- not content sophistication.
  20. Reading in grades 7-12 reading should be new focus. This is especially highlighted by AYP. It may be that 45 min. periods must end.
- (II)
21. Early reading identification in grades K-2 saves time in the long run. (II)
  22. Calendar/time. (II)
  23. Transformation will be required.
  24. Adolescent literacy is important.

### **Debrief of the January 24/25 Symposium:**

The symposium set the vision for the future and our work. A list of Guiding Ideas/Goals which will drive the review process was established.

1. Meta cognitive skills must be addressed.
2. Literacy.
3. Buy in from all stakeholders.
4. Must be jargon free and understandable.
5. Results must interface with next steps for students.
6. Less is more.
7. Interdisciplinary connections.
8. Core set of essential knowledge.

9. Technological changes must be addressed.
10. LR must come out of the statue- can go into rules.
11. Build into content standards – self-change.
12. All players must be at the table.
13. How do our standards get us to the end results?
14. Standards review as lever to reform education- impact broader view/context for review.
15. Content areas must have ongoing links for interdisciplinary work. 16. Time is critical. Do not get mired in process.
17. Examine research when it's available. Including development issues/ How People Learn.
18. Allow room for local autonomy (There is tension with needs of assessment system.)
19. Look at best practices and data.
20. Intent of original MLR identifies “core”. What do we still believe?  
What do we want to re-examine.
21. MLR should be aligned to real world-rigor, relevance.
22. Is it a given (expectation) that our approach (e.g. K-2, 3-5) is the same as original MLR?
23. Must keep in mind Dr. Willard Daggett's notion of learning. (Quadrant D- High content, high application.)
24. Give guidance in field.
25. What is core learning?
26. Remove barriers to innovation.

MDoE diagram:

Patrick shared a diagram illustrating the integration of educational efforts at the Department. This diagram is attached to the minutes.

### **Synthesizing our current research base:**

In small groups we discussed the vision/goals we listed earlier in the day. Our charge was to sugar down (prioritize and determine the most important) values and goals which will guide us in the process and the content.

Anita will prepare the list for the March 3 meeting.

### **Information sharing:**

#### **1. MLR Review Process:**

Anita distributed a draft document which outlined the LR Review Process from a system-wide approach. This document outlined the roles that each group, the Commissioner, etc. will play in the process. Members shared with Anita what they liked about the document and made suggestions for change.

#### **3. Content Area Panel form:**

On 2/1 an informational letter went out to a wide audience asking for recommendations for content area panelists. A lively discussion followed as to “who” should be included on the panels. Many members felt the group should be smaller and many felt the panel should be more inclusive. The group felt that all stakeholders should be involved but did not recommend a specific number. This will be discussed further at a future meeting.

**Volunteer to take minutes at next meeting: Don Cannan.**

**Next meeting: March 3, 2005, location to be announced.**

Patrick thanked Anita for her hard work as well as the group for their continued efforts.